

**House of Representatives
Office of the Clerk
H-154, U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20515**

Amendment of Solicitation

LIMS Port

PAGE 1 OF 15 PAGES

1. AMENDMENT NO.

1

2. EFFECTIVE DATE

July 2, 2003

3. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (Street, County, State and Zip Code):

4A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
OPR03000682

4B. DATE

June 9, 2003

5. THIS ITEM AMENDS THE SOLICITATION AS DESCRIBED BELOW: (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation contract subject matter where feasible.)

This Amendment is issued to

- Provide House answers to questions submitted
- Provide the list of attendees at the Pre-Proposal Conference June 18, 2003,
- Change the delivery address for all written proposals from H-154, The Capitol to Rayburn House Office Building, Room 2401, and
- Change the delivery mechanism for the code porting test data from FTP to an HTTP delivery procedure.

The House will not accept further questions pertaining to the RFP. If any detail of the solicitation remains unclear then consider the solicitation in its entirety, assume the most appropriate course of action, and propose accordingly. All assumptions made in this regard shall be listed and clearly explained in your proposal.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 5A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

7. IMPORTANT: Contractor shall sign and return a copy of this amendment to the issuing office with their signed proposal.

8A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or Print)

9A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or Print)

Jeff Trandahl
Office of the Clerk

8A. Contractor/Offeror (Signature of person authorized to sign)

9B. Contracting Officer (Signature)



8C. Date Issued:

9C. Date Issued:

Question 1

Can you provide the complete Natural/Adabas source code, DDMs and FDTs at this time in SYSTRANS format?

Answer

Yes, upon request.

Question 2

Can you provide the company names and contact numbers for any companies who assisted in the review of LIMS options, LIMS feasibility studies, LIMS design recovery projects, LIMS software maintenance or similar activities over the past two years?

Answer

No.

Question 3

How many users are simultaneously logged on to the LIMS system during peak and normal operations?

Answer

Less than 50.

Question 4

How many LIMS sub-systems or major functional components are there?

Answer

16

Question 5

Is any of the Natural source code CONSTRUCT generated?

Answer

No.

Question 6

Can you provide the COBOL and JCL source code with the Natural code?

Answer

All of the source code including COBOL and Assembler as well as all of the JCL was provided at the Pre-Proposal Conference.

Question 7

Do you have a test database? If so can you provide a copy in ADASAV format?

Answer

Yes we do have a test database, however we feel it is not relevant or necessary to give this data to you for the project. . However, if you are referring to the code porting tests, the House will provide the tables and data for this phase of the bidding process on July 10, 2003.

Question 8

Will an attendees list for the bidders' conference be published?

Answer

Yes, along with the House answers to questions submitted.

Question 9

Can you provide the existing LIMS documentation or functional specs in electronic format?

Answer

This documentation was provided at the Pre-Proposal Conference.

Question 10

Does the House have other Natural/Adabas applications? If yes what are the plans for these applications?

Answer

Yes; but these applications are not applicable to this project.

Question 11

Can you provide an estimate of the annual costs of running and maintaining the current Natural/Adabas environment including software and hardware license costs and operating expenses including staff or contractor support personnel?

Answer

Not relevant to this RFP.

Question 12

Do you have a preferred delivery date for completion of the project?

Answer

This will be up to the vendor to propose.

Question 13

What is the current status of the Software AG product licenses? Are the products current and on support from Software AG?

Answer

All products are supported but not current.

Question 14

Does the House have existing licenses for the Software AG products on HP-UX and/or Windows 2003? Can these be made available for the Code Porting Tests?

Answer

House licenses will not be made available for the Code Porting tests.

Question 15

When will the House renew its Natural/Adabas licenses and for what period?

Answer

Not relevant to this project.

Question 16

Is the primary objective of the project to downsize from the mainframe to a more cost effective hardware/OS platform while minimizing the risk by preserving the functionality and business rules of the current Natural/Adabas application?

Answer

Yes.

Question 17

We can provide alternative solutions for migrating the application to a more cost effective platform while preserving the application functionality. Would alternative proposals reflecting these solutions be reviewed by the House or be judged technically non-compliant regardless of the cost or risk advantages?

Answer

The House is not looking at alternative Porting options other than those stated in the RFP.

Question 18

We are a Canadian Corporation with principal operations in Ottawa, Ontario and White Rock, British Columbia. We do not at the current time have a US based subsidiary. If our proposal were selected as the winning proposal would the House contract with us as a Canadian Corporation or would you require us to establish a US based subsidiary to execute the contract?

Answer

Should your company be selected, the House would contract with you as a Canadian Corporation.

Question 19

Would it be possible to provide a copy of the attendees list for the bidders' conference now rather than on Jun 26 with the other answers to questions? We are anxious to investigate potential teaming arrangements and would like to have as much time as possible for this activity, particularly given the likely summer vacation schedule conflicts.

Answer

No.

Question 20

Section C.3.3. Does the Government intend the entire Task 3 to be a single deliverable? Or do the components under Task 3 constitute separate individual deliverables?

Answer

This is up to the vendor to propose.

Question 21

Section C.3.4. Under Task 4, in addition to furnishing all server hardware and software and all client software, does the Government intend for the vendor to install and configure all server hardware and software and all client software? Does the Government intend for the vendor to integrate these server hardware and software and client software with the House network? If so, can the Government provide the documentation to the network?

Answer

At the time of implementation, House personnel from the Office of the Clerk and The Chief Administrative Officer will provide assistance to the contractor to integrate the new system into the existing House

infrastructure.

Question 22

Section G.5 The RFP mentions the Contract Administration Plan (CAP). Does CAP already exist? Or is this to be drafted/finalized by the vendor? What are the contents of CAP?

Answer

The Contract Administration Plan (CAP) is generated and agreed upon by both parties after the contract has been awarded but before actual work begins on the contract. The plan is a tool for administering the contract and defines the roles and responsibilities of the contracting parties. Both parties will agree to the conditions within the CAP and sign the document before any work begins.

Question 23

Section L.1.c. What is the procedure for the FTP transmission? How early can the Government deliver the documents via FTP?

Answer

The procedure for delivering the code porting test data has changed from FTP to receiving the data via HTTP. A handout with procedures explaining how to receive this data via HTTP was explained fully at the pre-proposal conference on June 18, 2003. You may either pick up the test data in person at the Rayburn House Office Building or you can receive the test data electronically. Either way, you must fax a copy of the request form that was in your pre-proposal packet requesting a copy of the test data. The request must be faxed to V'Anne Tugbang, Office of the Clerk, at (202) 225-5888. The sequence in which these requests are received at the House will determine the order in which the vendors will demonstrate the results of their code ports during the week of August 11th through August 15th.

Question 24

Section L.1.c Can the Government provide a demonstration of the current system that the vendor will be porting, as part of the Code Porting Tests? We understand that the Government is providing the documentation. However, in our experience, some documentation may not be as accurate.

Answer

We will not provide a demonstration, however a complete set of test scripts and screen shots will be provided with the code porting test data. The test scripts will show you examples of how the system should look and what results should be achieved..

Question 25

Section L.1.c Are tabs (to designate proposal sections) included in the page count?

Answer

No.

Question 26

Section L.1.c. The RFP indicates that a GSA Schedule should be submitted. Is the GSA Schedule submission part of Binder I or Binder II?

Answer

Binder II.

Question 27

Section L.1.c Is the 3-page limit for the description of each project or of all 6 projects (3 current and 3 prior)?

Answer

The 3-page limit is for each project.

Question 28

Section L.1.c Is the Section K response (e.g., five years of financial statements/annual reports) included in the page count?

Answer

Yes.

Question 29

On page 4 request clarifications of the following:

For purposes of this Statement of Work, the term "port" means the re-platforming of application software and data from one operating system to another where the code and the data are substantially maintained intact. Changes to the components should be restricted to instances where they are necessary due to the differing operating systems.

Question:

Is the exact expectation noted above mean that the port should demonstrate the Adabase database and the source code (Natural, Cobol and Assembler) can be supported on Windows 200X and HP-UNIX and function as is;

or

is the expectation that the port should demonstrate that the LIMS system and its individual components (I.e., Source Code and data) can be supported on Windows 200X and HP-UNIX platforms and function as is.

Since it is our understanding that changes to the components will be impacted by the operating systems, it is our assumption that as long as the Port can demonstrate **exact** functionality for LIMS, the data is the same and the approximate number of software modules are also the same, the demonstration will not be limited to only Adabase, Natural, Cobol and Assembler COTS Products.

Request clarification.

Answer

In this effort, the underlying database will remain ADABAS and the programming language will remain Natural. Both products will be upgraded to the most current version applicable to the port. COBOL and Assembler programs should also be converted to Natural if possible. Changing the underlying database and programming language from ADABAS and Natural is not acceptable.

Question 30

We propose to use HP UNIX version 11.0 and Windows 2000 for the Code Porting test. Is that acceptable?

Answer

The HP-UX version must be the current release and Windows must be Windows 2003.

Question 31

Do all personnel who work on this assignment need to be US Citizens, 2003 or can Green Card/H1B holders also work on this assignment as long as they are cleared by the Capitol Police in accordance with the procedures stated in paragraph H.2?

Answer

Non US Citizens are able to work on this project as long as they are able to be cleared by the Capitol Police in accordance with the RFP.

Question 32

Section F.4 and F.5 Will the House of Representatives consider alternative language to Sections F.4 and F.5?

Answer

F.4 and F.5 are House standard clauses.

Question 33

Section G.4.2 Will the House consider, at the end of the second line on p.13, inserting "action" after "corrective" and deleting "or additional procedures". Also insert "action" after "corrective" in the third line and delete "or additional procedures".

Answer

Yes, the House would consider this request.

Question 34

Section L.1.c pages 22 and 25. Will the House confirm that the House of Representatives will be providing copies of applicable LIMS application code to vendors rather than the operating software for Adabas, Natural and Cobol.

Answer

Yes, the House will be providing only application source code, JCL and the applicable data for the code porting tests.

Question 35

The RFP mentioned web-based, but did not mention access methods or security. Would evaluators be interested in a wireless remote data access demonstration (PDA/Cell Phone) along with the standard PC access during our visit, or is that not a likely scenario for the future?

Answer

No, this is not applicable at this time.

Question 36

What are the performance requirements for the current system in terms of number of simultaneous users that need to be supported? Are the requirements for the new system significantly higher?

Answer

As stated at the pre-proposal conference, at no time should there be more than 50 users on the system at one time. This requirement will not change with the new system.

Question 37

What are the uptime requirements for the system in the future? Is it desirable to host a 24x7 system, or is there an expected period of downtime each day for maintenance/upgrades?

Answer

System availability requirements are stated in section 11.5 of the LIMS Technical Requirements Analysis on page 11-3. This is one of the documents you received at the pre-proposal conference.

Question 38

What type of data exports are required/envisioned? Will the external agencies that require the export be fixed or dynamic? Are the end points of the transfer fixed or variable? Are there standard formats or do individual agencies require specific content and format? Are these exports at regularly defined intervals or on as needed basis?

Answer

LIMS interfaces with several other agencies (Library of Congress, Senate, GPO). All of these interfaces are explained in section 5 of the Technical Requirements Analysis. The interface formats are fixed, however they are different for each Agency. Interfacing with other agencies takes place on regularly scheduled intervals.

Question 39

Aside from the re-hosting of LIMS via the RFP, is there a separate project to rewrite LIMS? What is the status of that project or expected completion date?

Answer

No, there is no separate project to rewrite LIMS.

Question 40

What is the budget for this project?

Answer

The budget is undetermined at this time.

Question 41

Will the Evaluation Criteria for the code port test be made public before the test? (test, i.e. code port evaluation demonstration)

Answer

Yes, the testing scripts will be made available along with the code porting test data.

Question 42

Will test data be provided with samples for the sample port tests?

Answer

Yes. When you receive the source code for the code porting test you will receive all of the related ADABAS tables with data.

Question 43

On page 7, bullet point number 4: "Natural is the only programming language used . . .". Could you please elaborate further on that bullet point?

Answer

All existing Natural programs shall remain Natural in the Proof of Concept Component. COBOL and Assembler programs should also be converted to Natural unless it would be beneficial to change these programs to a language other than Natural. If other languages are to be used, they must be discussed with the House prior to implementation.

Question 44

Is Bearing Point conflicted out of bidding?

Answer

If you mean is Bearing Point excluded from bidding, the answer is No.

Question 45

Are there restrictions on where the work is performed (i.e. outside the US)?

Answer

No, but be reminded of the requirement in Section H.2.

Question 46

What is the capacity requirement for HP UX & Windows in Task 3 and 4?

Answer

The Contractor should size the system according to the requirements of the system as discussed during the Pre-Proposal Conference.

Question 47

Which versions of HP-UX & Windows should be used for the demo?

Answer

The most current release of HP-UX and Windows 2003.

Question 48

How would the demo and the actual port be tested to confirm compliance to the original mainframe behavior?

Answer

The House will be providing test scripts for the code porting tests only. Implementation is TBD.

Question 49

How do you currently switch from the current congress to the previous congress? Do you reload your computer system or do you have both running simultaneously?

Answer

Both are running simultaneously – a different CICS transaction is used for each Congress.

Question 50

Why such a short window to perform a very critical part of this RFP? 3 weeks?

Answer

Actually there are 4 weeks from delivery of the Porting data to the demo. This timeframe allows the House the ability to determine a vendor's technical capabilities. We do not wish to have a vendor convert this data manually.

Question 51

How do vendors verify the validity of the tests? How do we know Natural Demo ported okay?

Answer

The House is providing test scripts and results.

Question 52

Are there 300 Natural Programs on-line or batch modules?

Answer

All on-line.

Question 53

For delivery of the servers, will hand trucks be available at the loading dock?

Answer

Probably not.

Question 54

You stated that Tasks 3 & 4 are optional. Does that mean they don't have to be part of the proposal? Or does that mean they are optional for you if you choose to proceed?

Answer

Implementation of Task 3 and Task 4 are Optional for the House. You must include an estimate for these two tasks with your proposal.

Question 55

Will the vendors that participated in previous phases of this project be able to submit bids for this phase?

Answer

Yes, if they were present at the Pre-Proposal Conference. The only vendor excluded is the IV&V vendor.

Question 56

For the porting test, will you allow for the vendor to use the IBM AIX version of UNIX?

Answer

No.

Question 57

Will you allow the demo of the porting test to be done remotely using Netmeeting?

Answer

No.

Question 58

Will the hardware remain in your possession for testing or after the demo can we take them back?

Answer

You will take back all hardware upon completion of the test.

Question 59

What function do the COBOL & Assembler programs perform for the code porting test?

Answer

Upper and lower case conversion for the code porting test only.

Question 60

Are there specific GUI requirements for the conversion or is it up to the vendors to propose?

Answer

This is up to the vendor to propose.

Question 61

Is LIMS a data source for adjacent systems? If yes, how many system interface programs are there and what are they written in? What platform and operating systems do the adjacent systems run on?

Answer

Yes. All of this information is included in the Technical Requirements Analysis and was discussed at the Pre-Proposal Conference. We feel the platform and operating system the adjacent systems run on are non relevant to this proposal.

Question 62

Does the House have a preferred Hardware vendor? If yes, who is it.

Answer

No.

Question 63

Roughly how many user reports are there, and what are they written in?

Answer

Natural and DCF script format are used for creating most reports. This was also discussed at the Pre-Proposal Conference. There is detailed information on each report in the LIMS Functional Requirements Analysis.

Question 64

The information required in Section K may be quite extensive. Will the House consider either (a) moving this section to the Administrative and Price Proposal or (b) excluding Section K from the 85 page limit?

Answer

No.

Question 65

Is Bearing Point (KPMG) allowed to submit a proposal for Stage 4 of the LIMS project?

Answer

Yes.

Question 66

Will the House permit work to be performed at an offsite location? In particular the code porting is an activity that is more easily performed in a contractor's lab environment.

Answer

Yes. As a matter of fact, the work must be performed offsite. We do not have room to accommodate permanent on-site vendors for this effort.

Question 67

Can the House provide the current version of ADABAS and Natural that are being used.

Answer

The House will not provide the actual software however, the current LIMS system is using Natural version 2.2.8 and ADABAS version 6.2.1.

Question 68

Will the House consider excluding the hardware and software from the fixed price bids that are being required for each task for the following reasons:

- a. ADABAS and Natural are only available from a single manufacturer who has indicated that they would not sell software to us for use on this project.
- b. The software vendor's assistance will be required to properly size the hardware for the production and other environments that the House may require. Without assistance of the software vendor, it will be difficult to size and price the hardware.
- c. The House has not yet determined whether it will use UNIX or a Windows 200X platform. Pricing of the hardware will vary depending on the platform selected.

Answer

The House feels it is up to the bidding vendor to acquire the necessary resources to propose a legitimate bid and also to have the appropriate knowledge to produce an accurate sizing of hardware and software needs. We understand there will be a need to size and price both a UNIX based and Windows based system. It is up to the vendor to provide pricing for both. Pricing of both platforms will be considered before the House makes a decision as to which platform to choose.

LIMS Port Pre-Proposal Conference Attendance 06/18/03				
Name	Company	Company Address	Phone	E-mail Address
David M. Garza	Trinity Millennium Group, Inc.	2424 Babcock Rd, Suite 300 San Antonio, TX 78229	(210) 615-1606	dmgarza@tringroup.com
David Vogel	Compass Information Systems, Inc.	1756 Belle Court Millersville, MD 21108	(410) 923-6300	dvogel@compassinfo.net
Michael King	Compass Information Systems, Inc.	1756 Belle Court Millersville, MD 21108	(410) 923-6300	mking@compassinfo.net
Daniel Wang	QCOM, Inc.	475 Rt. 520, Suite 200 Marlboro, NJ 07746	(732) 772-0990	dwang@qcominc.com
Vivek Sawhney	QCOM, Inc.	475 Rt. 520, Suite 200 Marlboro, NJ 07746	(732) 772-0990 ext. 17	vivek@qcominc.com
Frank Driscoll	FBD Associates, Inc. and Portage Solutions, LLC.	15074 Royal Avenue White Rock, BC V4B1L9 Canada	(604) 538-5094	fbdris1@attglobal.net
Bill Delany	FBD Associates, Inc. and Portage Solutions, LLC.	15074 Royal Avenue White Rock, BC V4B1L9 Canada	(604) 538-5094	
Paul Waldron	FBD Associates, Inc. and Portage Solutions, LLC.	15074 Royal Avenue White Rock, BC V4B1L9 Canada	(604) 538-5094	
Joseph X. DiPrinzio	Isavix Corporation	455 Springpark Place, Suite 150 Herndon, VA 20170	(703) 689-3190 ext. 17	joseph@isavix.com
Sanjay Mandhan	Isavix Corporation	455 Springpark Place, Suite 150 Herndon, VA 20170	(703) 689-3190	
Todd Van Haaren	Software AG, Inc.	11190 Sunrise Valley Drive Reston, VA 20191	(703) 391-6671	todd.vanhaaren@softwareagusa.com
Paul Sibbald	Software AG, Inc.	11190 Sunrise Valley Drive Reston, VA 20191	(703) 391-8120	paul.sibbald@softwareagusa.com
Bruce Beaman	Software AG, Inc.	11190 Sunrise Valley Drive Reston, VA 20191	(703) 391-8120	
Joeshph T. Gaddis	SoftSol Resources, Inc.	48383 Fremont Blvd Fremont, CA 94538	(303) 693-4241	jgaddis@softsolresources.com
William (Chuck) Hill	Programming Solutions, Inc.	9000 Telford Crossing Brooklyn Park, MN 55443	(763) 424-8154	chill@mr.net
Jim Porter	ExcelaCom	1601 North Kent Street, Suite 1014 Arlington, VA 22009	(703) 294-6900	jporter@excelacom.com

Name	Company	Company Address	Phone	E-mail Address
Scott Cumby	ExcelaCom	1601 North Kent Street, Suite 1014 Arlington, VA 22009	(703) 294-6900	scottc@excelacom.com
Jim Kingsbury	Gray Hawk Technology Solutions, LLC	4501 Ford Ave, Suite 1320 Alexandria, VA 22302	(703) 575-3899	kingsbury.jim@grayhawksystems.com
Scott Gordon	Gray Hawk Technology Solutions, LLC	4501 Ford Ave, Suite 1320 Alexandria, VA 22302	(703) 575-3899	gordon.scott@grayhawksystems.com
Rick McCarthy	Gray Hawk Technology Solutions, LLC	4501 Ford Ave, Suite 1320 Alexandria, VA 22302	(703) 575-3899	
Jerry D. Moses	N-CORE Systems, Inc.	PO Box 70913 Richmond, VA 23255	(804) 402-3160	jdmoses@n-core.com
Bruce de Wet	N-CORE Systems, Inc.	PO Box 70913 Richmond, VA 23255	(804) 402-3161	bdewet@n-core.com
Jeannette Bernardo	Bart & Associates, Inc.	4915 St. Elmo Ave., # 501 Bethesda, MD 20814	(240) 401-6321	bernardoj@bna-inc.com
Jesus Medrano	Bart & Associates, Inc.	4915 St. Elmo Ave., # 501 Bethesda, MD 20814	(240) 401-6321	medrano@bna-inc.com
Wayman Ng	Bart & Associates, Inc.	4915 St. Elmo Ave., # 501 Bethesda, MD 20814	(240) 401-6321	wng@bna-inc.com
Tobi Harris	Strategic Systems Solutions, Inc.		(215) 706-2459	tobi.harris@sss-inc.com
Paul Dinning	Strategic Systems Solutions, Inc.		(215) 706-2459	
Steve Daly	Strategic Systems Solutions, Inc.	113 Rock Road Horshaum, PA 19044	(215) 706-2452	steve.daly@sss-inc.com
Brian J. Pierce	Bearing Point			ewillner@bearingpoint.net
Brian M. Mamrak	Bearing Point		(703) 747-6728	bmamrak@bearingpoint.net
Travis L. Harvey	Bearing Point		(703) 869-9451	tlharvey@bearingpoint.net
Jeffrey T. Benson	Delex Systems, Inc	1953 Gallows Rd, Suite 700 Vienna, VA 22182	(703) 734-8300	jbenenson@delex.com
Cheryl L. Czerniec	Delex Systems, Inc	1953 Gallows Rd, Suite 700 Vienna, VA 22182	(703) 734-8300 x 286	cczerniec@delex.com
Robert Berry	RDB Services, Inc.	1111 Tiverton Rd, Suite 201 Mechanicsburg, PA 17050	(717) 728-9890	rberry@rdbservices.biz
Philip Palmer	RDB Services, Inc.	1111 Tiverton Rd, Suite 201 Mechanicsburg, PA 17050	(717) 728-9890	ppalmer@gt-systems.com

Name	Company	Company Address	Phone	E-mail Address
Charles Bunce	Information Analysis, Inc.		(410) 461-2342	
Stan Reese	Information Analysis, Inc.		(410) 461-2342	
Joe Anderson	Advanced Software Systems, Inc.	8300 Merrifield Ave, 3rd Floor Fairfax, VA 22031	(703) 645-9820	janderson@assyst.net
Ron Berry	Oracle Corp.	1910 Oracle Way Reston, VA 20190	(410) 309-5125	ron.berry@oracle.com
Richard DeStefano	Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	470 Friendship Road Harrisburg, PA 17111	(717) 651-3244	rich_destefano@compaid.com
Danny Davis	Titan Corporation, Enterprise Integration Group	1593 Spring Hill Rd, Suite 300 Vienna, VA 22182	(703) 852-4031	Danny.Davis@titan.com
Rich Kolker	Titan Corporation, Enterprise Integration Group	1593 Spring Hill Rd, Suite 300 Vienna, VA 22182	(703) 852-4031	
Greg Mundell	Titan Corporation, Enterprise Integration Group	1593 Spring Hill Rd, Suite 300 Vienna, VA 22182	(703) 852-4031	gregory.mundell@titan.com
Christy Taylor	IBM Business Consulting Services	1616 N. Ft. Meyer Drive Arlington, VA 22209	(703) 741-2562	
Leslie Lesch	IBM Business Consulting Services	1616 N. Ft. Meyer Drive Arlington, VA 22209	(703) 741-2562	leslie.lesch@us.ibm.com